



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/889,319 | 10/26/2001 | Toshihiko Satou | 22.852 | 2323 |

22852 7590 01/26/2005

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2675

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/889,319

Applicant(s)

SATOU ET AL.

Examiner

Srilakshmi K. Kumar

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on September 9, 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following action is in response to the amendment filed, September 9, 2004. Claims 1-8 and 10 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kizaki et al (US 5.126.868).

As to independent claim 1, Kizaki et al disclose a display device (Fig. 1) including at least one display cell (Fig. 1 items 101 or 102) sealed by one seal member (Fig. 1, item 110) in which an electro optical converting member (liquid crystal) is held by two substrates (col. 6, lines 6-25), and having a defective area and a normal area in the inside of the seal member; Although Kizaki et al do not disclose a defective area and a normal area, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that most LCD panels would have a defective area next to the seal member as there would be some interference with the seal member;

another at least one display cell (Fig. 1, items 101 or 102) sealed by another seal member (Fig. 1, item 110) in which the electro-optical converting member (liquid crystal) is held by two substrates (col. 6, lines 6-25), and having the defective area and normal area in the inside of the seal member; and these display cells being overlapped; Although Kizaki et al do not disclose a defective area and a normal area, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2675

that most LCD panels would have a defective area next to the seal member as there would be some interference with the seal member;

characterized in that the display cell provided to an opposite side of an observer has a normal area, which is wider than the display cell provided to a side of the observer (Figs. 1 and 12). Although Kizaki et al do not disclose where the display cell is wider, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that LC cells could be made to be of any size and shape dependent on user requirements.

As to dependent claim 2, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, characterized in that the display cell is a liquid crystal display cell in which the electro optical converting member consists of a liquid crystal (Fig. 1, item 113, col. 6, lines 6-44).

As to dependent claim 3, limitations of claim 2, and further comprising, wherein the display device is formed by overlapping two liquid crystal display cells and at least one liquid crystal display cell is a drive cell to which a liquid crystal drive voltage is applied (col. 7, lines 27-54).

As to dependent claim 4, limitations of claim 2, and further comprising, wherein the display device is formed by overlapping two liquid crystal display cells, one liquid crystal display cell is a drive cell to which a liquid crystal drive voltage is applied, and the other liquid crystal display cell is a correction cell to which the liquid crystal drive voltage is not applied (col. 7, lines 27-54).

As to dependent claim 5, limitations of claim 4, and further comprising, where in the drive cell and the correction cell, one of the inside sizes of the seal member is larger than the other side (Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 6-25).

As to dependent claim 6, limitations of claim 4, and further comprising, wherein one of the sizes of an effective display area of the drive cell and the correction cell is larger than the other size of the effective area (Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 6-25).

As to dependent claim 7, limitations of claim 5 or 6, and further comprising, wherein the defective area having defects of cell gap and/or alignment in the vicinity of the inside of the seal member of the drive cell is overlapped in the range of the normal area having no defect of the correction cell (col. 9, lines 29-39)

As to dependent claim 8, limitations of claim 5 or 6, and further comprising, wherein the defective area having defects of cell gap and/or alignment in the vicinity of the inside of the seal member of the correction cell is overlapped in the range of the normal area having no defect of the correction cell (col. 9, lines 29-39)

As to dependent claim 10, limitations of any one of claims 2-8, and further comprising, wherein the liquid crystal is an STN liquid crystal (col. 5, lines 59-63).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed September 9, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues where the prior art Kizaki does not teach the limitation of claim 1, "wherein the display cell provides to an opposite side of an observer has a normal area, which is wider than that of the display cell provided to the side of the observer". Kizaki teaches in Fig. 12, where the display cell provides to an opposite side of an observer has a normal area, which is wider than that of the display cell provided to the side of the observer, specifically, Fig. 12, item

Art Unit: 2675

112 is shown to be wider than the display cell 101. As shown, the limitations of the above invention are disclosed by Kizaki. Therefore, the rejection has been maintained and made final.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srilakshmi K. Kumar whose telephone number is 703 306 5575. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, xxxx xxxx can be reached on xxx xxx xxxx. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 4700.

Srilakshmi K. Kumar

Application/Control Number: 09/889,319
Art Unit: 2675

Page 6

Examiner
Art Unit 2675

SKK
January 14, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dennis-Doon Chow".

DENNIS-DOON CHOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER